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ABSTRACT: Two field experiments were performed during 2000 and 2001 summer seasons at the Agricultural Experimental Station of the National Research Centre at Shalakan, Kalubia Governorate, Egypt. The objective of the experiment was to study the effect of adding urea $1 \%$ to herbicide solution on weed control efficiency in maize crop. Weed control treatments were as follows: Bentazon, Fluroxypyr, Metosulam, Isoproturon, Bentazon + urea 1\%, Fluroxypyr + urea $1 \%$, Metosulam + urea $1 \%$, Isoproturon + urea $1 \%$, one hand hoeing, two hand hoeing and control.

Results showed that all weed control treatments significantly depressed weed growth comparing to the unweeded one. Fluroxypyr treatment gave the best control of broad-leaved weeds in both seasons followed by that of two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr mixed with urea and Metosulam mixed with urea treatments, respectively. Two hand hoeing was significantly the best control of grasses and total weeds in both seasons followed by that of Fluroxypyr and Fluroxypyr mixed with urea treatments, respectively.

All herbicidal treatments and two hand hoeing method markedly increased growth, yield and yield attributes as well as chemical composition of maize grains in both seasons. Maximum values of growth eharacters, yield and yield attributes were recorded from Fluroxypyr followed by two hand hoeing treatment, Fluroxypyr mixed with urea $1 \%$ and Metosulam mixed with urea $1 \%$, respectively in both seasons. While, the highest values of plant height at harvest ( cm ) stem diameter (cm), protein and oil \% were obtained by two hand hoeing followed by that of Fluroxypyr and Fluroxypyr mixed with urea $1 \%$ as well as Metosulam + urea $1 \%$, respectively in both seasons.

## INTRODUCTION

Increase grain yield of maize could be achieved by the development of high yielding varieties, better soil management and use of improved farm techniques. Weed control is one of the essential cultural practices for raising maize yield and improving its quality. The reduction in maize yield due to uncontrolled weed growth reached to $50 \%$ as calculated by El-Wekil et al. (1992). Effective weed control and high yield of maize were achieved by application of two hand hoeing (El-Bially, 1995; Hussein, 1997; Ahmed, 1999; Abd El-Samie, 2000 and El-Metwally et al., 2001), one hand hoeing (ElWekil et al., 1991); Bentazon (Saigusa et al., 1993, Corkern et al., 1999 and Wilcut et al., 1999). Moshtohry et al. (1995) found that Fluroxypyr treatment gave the best control of broad-leaved weeds. Many other investigators came to the same conclusion (Schlotter and Schuster, 1992; Yehia et al., 1992 and Roushdy, 1997).

However, the recommended dose of herbicide is relatively high and hence its cost price is too expensive under the Egyptian conditions. Recently, some evidence has been gathered that adding some additives especially
the nitrogenous fertilizèr to herbicide solution could increase its activity, consequently the dose of herbicide could be lowered and its cost price could be decreased. Moreover, lowering the dose of any herbicide is much appreciated from the point of view of minimizing pollution. In this respect, El-Desoki et al. (1993), Vizantinopoulos and Katranis (1998), Lesnik et al. (1999) and Metwally and Hassan (2001) reported that using some herbicides + urea or ammonium sulphate had higher efficiency in controlling annual weeds and increased yield and its components of wheat or maize as compared with other treatments used.

Therefore, the aim of the present work is to study the effect of some herbicides alone or in combination with urea on weed control efficiency in maize crop.

## MATERIALSANDMETHODS

Two field experiments were carried out during the two summer seasons of 2000 and 2001 at the Experimental Farm of National Research Centre at Shalakan, Kalubia Governorate, Egypt to study the influence of some herbicides applied alone or in combination with urea on
growth, yield and yield attributes of maize cv. Single cross Wattania 4 as well as associated weeds. The soil texture was clay loam with medium fertility, containing $1.78 \%$ organic matter and pH 7.8 . A randomized complete blocks design with four replications was used in the two seasons. The normal cultural practices of growing maize plants were applied. Weed control treatments were as follows:

1. Bentazon (3-isopropyl 1H2, 1, 3-benzathiadiazin-4(3II) one, 2, 2 -dioxide), known commercially as Basagran $48 \%$ E.C., sprayed after 3 weeks from sowing at the rate of 0.75 L/fed.
2. Fluroxypyr (4-Amino-3,5-Dichloro-6-fluoro-2pyridloxy Acetic Acid), known commercially as Starane $20 \%$ E.C. sprayed 3 weeks from sowing at the rate of $0.200 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed.
3. Metosulam (N-2,6-dichloro-3-methyl phenyl)-5,7-dimethoxy-[1,2,4]
Triazolo [1,5a] pyrimidine -2-sulphona mide), known commereially as Sinal 10 Sc sprayed 3 weeks from sowing at the rate of 0.030 L/fed.
4. Isoproturon (3-(4-Isoproyl phenyl)-1,1-dimethyl urea), known commercially as Arelon $50 \%$ sprayed 4 weeks from sowing at the rate of $1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$.
5. Bentazon at the rate of $0.375 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$.
6. Fluroxypyr at the rate of $0.1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$.
7. Metosulam at the rate of $0.015 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$.
8. Isoproturon at the rate of $0.5 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed + urea $1 \%$.
9. One hand hoeing (before the first irrigation).
10. Two hand hoeing (before the first and the second irrigations).
11. Unweeded check (control) without hoeing or herbicide.
The herbicides were applied with knapsack sprayer equipped with one nozzle boom and water volume was $200 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$.

The experimental basic unit included 5 ridges, 70 cm apart and 3 m length, occupying an area of $10.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. The previous winter crop was wheat (Triticum aestivum, L.) in both seasons. Maize plants were sown on one side of the ridge in hills 30 cm apart on $20^{\text {in }}$ and $25^{\text {ti }}$ May in 2000 and 2001 seasons, respectively. Plants were thinned to one plant per hill ( 20000
plants/fed) before the first irrigation. Nitrogen in the form of urea ( $46 \% \mathrm{~N}$ ) was added in the two equal portions, after thinning and before the first and second irrigation (at a rate of 105 kg $\mathrm{N} /$ fed). Calcium superphosphate ( $15.5 \% \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ ) was applied during land preparation (at a rate of 150 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{fed}$ ).

## Studied characters:

## 1. Weeds:

Weeds were hand pulled from one square meter from each plot after 50 and 70 days from sowing and then were identified and classified into three groups i.e. broad-leaved, grasses and total weeds, fresh and dry weight of each group ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) were recorded. The common weeds in both growing seasons were Amaranthus caudatus, L.; Echinochola colonum, L.; Portulaca oleraceae, L.; Corchorus olitorius, L.; Xanthium brasilicum, L.; Convolvulus arvensis, L : and Cynodon dactylon, L .

## 2. Maize plants: <br> A. Plant growth:

In both seasons at 50 and 70 days from sowing, sample of five plants were taken randomly from each plot to determine plant height (cm), number of
leaves/plant as .well as fresh and dry weight of plant (g).

## B. Yield and yield attributes:

At harvest, random samples of ten guarded plants were taken from each plot to estimate plant height (cm), stem diameter recorded at the internode below ear position, ear diameter (cm), ear length (cm), number of grains/row, ear grain weight (g), shelling percentage and 100 -grain weight. Grain yield per feddan was estimated from the weight of grains/plot adjusted to $15 \%$ moisture.

## C. Chemical composition of maize grains:

Total nitrogen content was estimated by the Kjeldahl method (Ranganna, 1979). N-values were multiplied by 6.25 to calculate protein content. Oil content was determined using the method described and used by Bedov (1970) using Soxhlet equipment.

## Statistical analysis:

All data were statistically analyzed according to the technique of analysis of variance (ANOVA) of A randomized Complete Blocks design and least significant difference (LSD) method was used to test the
differences between treatment means at $5 \%$ and $1 \%$ levels probability as published by Gomez and Gomez (1984).

## RESULTSANDDISCUSSION Effect of different weed control treatments on:

A: Maize weeds:
The effect of different weed control treatments on fresh and dry weight of maize weeds after 50 and 70 days from sowing are presented in Tables 1 and 2. It is worthy, in the beginning, to notice that the effect of different weed control treatments under investigation on dry weight of maize weeds followed similar trends to those of fresh weight.

## 1. Broad-leaved weeds ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ):

The results of weed control treatments presented in Tables 1 and 2 showed significant effects on fresh and dry weight of broadleaved weeds after 50 and 70 days from sowing. Fluroxypyr cause a significant depression in the fresh and dry weight of broad-leaved weeds after 50 and 70 days from sowing followed by two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea, and Metosulam alone, respectively in both seasons. On the contrary, the highest fresh and dry weight of broad-leaved
weeds were recorded with the unweeded treatment. However, there were no significant differences in the fresh weight of broad leaved between two hand hoeing and Fluroxypyr + urea at 50 and 70 days from sowing in both seasons, respectively. Also, no significant differences between Isoproturon + urea, Metosulam or Bentazon after 50 and 70 days from sowing.

## 2. Grass weeds $\left(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ :

Relevant data showed that fresh and dry weight of grass weeds were markedly decreased by different weed control treatments (Tables 1 and 2). Two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr, Fluroxypyr + urea and Metosulam + urea treatments were very effective in controlling most grass weeds at 50 and 70 days from sowing. On the other hand, the highest fresh and dry weight of grass weeds after 50 and 70 days from sowing were observed with unweeded treatment followed by that of Isoproturon, one hand hoeing and Bentazon treatments in both seasons as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

## 3. Total weeds ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ):

In both seasons, the highest decrease in fresh and dry weight of total weeds after 50 and 70 days

Table 1: Fresh and dry weight of weeds $\left(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ after 50 days from sowing as affected by weed control treatments during 2000 and 2001 growing seasons.

## 

| Treatments | Fresh weight at 50 days from sowing (g/m' $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Dry weight at 50 days from sowing (g/mi) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Broad leaved |  | Grasses |  | Total |  | Broad leaved |  | Grasses |  | Total |  |
|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 |
| Bentazon at $0.75 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 195.00 | 215.00 | 1275.001 | 300.00 | 1470.00 | 1515.00 | 39.00 | 43.00 | 212.50 | 216.67 | 251.50 | 259.67 |
| Fluroxypyr at $0.2 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed | 30.00 | 35.00 | 660.00 | 670.00 | 690.00 | 705.00 | 6.00 | 7.00 | 110.00 | 111.67 | 116.00 | 118.67 |
| Metosulam at $0.3 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 180.00 | 197.00 | 1245.001 | 1270.00 | 1425.00 | 1467.00 | 36.00 | 39.40 | 207.50 | 211.67 | 243.50 | 251.07 |
| Isoproturon at $1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 255.00 | 280.00 | 1740.001 | 1770.00 | 1995.00 | 2050.00 | 51.00 | 56.00 | 290.40 | 295.60 | 341.40 | 351.00 |
| Bentazon at $0.375 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed + urea 1\% | 150.00 | 162.00 | 1170.00 | 1190.00 | 1320.00 | 1352.00 | 30.00 | 32.40 | 195.20 | 198.34 | 225.20 | 230.74 |
| Fluroxypyr at $0.1 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed + urea $1 \%$ | 90.00 | 95.00 | 810.00 | 820.00 | 900.00 | 915.00 | 18.00 | 19.00 | 135.30 | 136.67 | 153.30 | 155.67 |
| Metosulam at $0.15 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 120.00 | 129.00 | 945.00 | 960.00 | 1065.00 | 1089.00 | 24.00 | 25.80 | 157.50 | 1 | 0 | 185.80 |
| Isoproturon at $0.5 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 180.00 | 195.00 | 1245.0 | 126 | 1425.0 | 1460.00 | 36.00 | 39:00 | 207.50 | 210 | 243.50 | 249.84 |
| One hand hoeing | 225.00 | 247.00 | 1575.00 | 1600.00 | 1800.00 | 1847.00 | 45.00 | 49.40 | 262.50 | 266.67 | 307.50 | 316.07 |
| Two hand hoeing | 75.00 | 80.00 | 570.00 | 580.00 | 645.00 | 660.00 | 15.00 | 16.00 | 95.00 | 96.67 | 110.00 | 112.67 |
| Control | 1800.00 | 1850.00 | 2250.002 | 2300.00 | 4050.00 | 4150.00 | 360.00 | 370.00 | 375.00 | 383.34 | 735.00 | 753.34 |
| F-test | ** | - | ** | ** | * | ** | ** | ** | - | - | + | \% |
| LSD. 5\% | 32.62 | 33.12 | 76.09 | 120.46 | 163.07 | 191.98 | 6.52 | 6.62 | 27.93 | 20.09 | 37.90 | 29.38 |
| 1\% | 43.49 | 44.16 | 101.45 | 160.61 | 217.41 | 255.96 | 8.70 | 8.83 | 37.24 | 26.78 | 50.53 | 39.17 |

Table 2: Fresh and dry weight of weeds ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) after 70 days from sowing as affected by weed control treatments during 2000 and 2001 growing seasons.

| Treatments | Fresh weight at 70 days from sowing (g/m) |  |  |  |  |  | Dry weight at 70 days from sowing (g/m) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Broad-leaved |  | Grasses |  | Total |  | Broad-leaved |  | Grasses |  | Total |  |
|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 |
| Bentazon at 0.75 L/fed | 253.50 | 279.50 | 1530.00 | 1560.00 | 1783.50 | 1839.50 | 50.70 | 55.90 | 255.00 | 260.00 | 305.70 | 31590 |
| Fluroxypyr at 0.2 Lfed | 39.00 | 45.50 | 792.00 | 804.00 | 831.00 | 849.50 | 7.80 | 9.10 | 132.00 | 134.00 | 139.80 | 143.10 |
| Metosulam at $0.3 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 234.00 | 256.10 | 1494.00 | 1524.00 | [728.00] | 1780.10 | 46.80 | 51.22 | 249.00 | 25400 | 295.80 | 305.22 |
| Isoproturon at 1 L/fed | 331.50 | 364.00 | 2088.00 | 2124.00 | 2419.50 | 2488.00 | 66.30 | 72.80 | 348.00 | 354.00 | 414.30 | 426.80 |
| Bentazon at $0.375 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 195.00 | 210.60 | 1404.00 | 1428.00 | 1599.00 | 1638.60 | 39.00 | 42.12 | 234.00 | 238.00 | 273.00 | 280.12 |
| Fluroxypyr at 0.1 l/ed + urea $1 \%$ | 117.00 | 123.50 | 972.00 | 984.00 | 1089.00 | 1107.50 | 23.40 | 24.70 | 162.00 | 164.00 | 185.40 | 188.70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Metosulam at } 0.15 \quad \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+ \\ & \text { urea } 1 \% \end{aligned}$ | 156.00 | 167.70 | 1134.00 | 1152.00 | 1290.00 | 1319.70 | 31.20 | 33.54 | 189.00 | 192.00 | 220.20 | 225.45 |
| Isoproturen at $0.5 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 230.00 | 253.50 | 1494.00 | 1518.00 | 1724.00 | 1771.50 | 46.00. | 50.70 | 249.00 | 253.00 | 295.00 | 203.70 |
| One hand hoeing | 295.00 | 321.10 | 1890.00 | 1920.00 | 2185.00 | 2241.10 | 59.00 | 64.22 | 315.00 | 320.00 | 374.00 | 384.20 |
| Two hand hoeing | 97.50 | 104.00 | 684.00 | 696.00 | 781.50 | 800.00 | 19.50 | 20.80 | 114.00 | 116.00 | 133.50 | 136.80 |
| Control | 2050.00 | 2405.00 | 2700.00 | 2760.00 | 4455.00 | 5165.00 | 410.00 | 481.00 | 450.00 | 460.00 | 860.00 | 941.00 |
| $F$-test | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| LSD 5\% | 32.92 | 33.91 | 106.30 | 111.64 | 174.03 | 218.33 | 6.58 | 6.78 | 17.74 | 18.61 | 36.48 | 38.09 |
| 1\% | 4389 | 45.21 | 141.73 | 148.86 | 278.43 | 291.05 | 8.78 | 9.04 | 23.65 | 24.81 | 48.65 | 50.78 |

from sowing were obtained by two hand hoeing followed by Fluroxypyr, •Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea treatments. The superior treatments decreased fresh weight of total weeds after 50 days from sowing than unweeded treatment by about $84.07,82.96,77.77,73.7$ and $67.41 \%$ in first season and by 84.10, 83.01, 77.95, 73.76 and $67.42 \%$ in the second season, respectively. Whereas, the superior treatments decreased the fresh weight of total weeds after 70 days from sowing than unweeded treatment by about $82.46,81.35$, $75.56,71.04$ and $64.11 \%$ in the first season and by $84.51,83.55$, $78.56,74.45$ and $68.27 \%$ in the second season, respectively. Viceversa, unweeded treatment resulted the highest values of fresh and dry weight of total weeds in both 2000 and 2001 seasons.

Generally, results in Tables 1 and 2 revealed that all herbicide treatments used alone or mixed with urea and hand hoeing decreased statistically fresh and dry weight of broad leaved, grasses and total weeds grown with maize as compared with unweeded treatment. These results may be due to the inhibition effect of herbicidal treatments on growth of weeds. Two hand hoeing,

Fluroxypyr, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea were the most effective for controlling of maize weeds. Also, Fluroxypyr, Metosulam and Bentazon as post-emergence herbicides produced a promising effect against weed prevailing in maize fields in comparison with unweeded treatment. The same conclusion was mentioned by E!Moursy and Badawi (1998), Rola and Golebiowska (1998), Rapparini èt al. (2000), Roibuet al. (2000) and El-Metwally et al. (2001).

## B. Growth of maize:

## B.1. Plant height (cm):

Weed control methods significantly affected plant height at 50 and 70 days from sowing in the two seasons (Table 3). Fluroxypyr treatment recorded the highest values of plant height followed by that of two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea, respectively. On the other hand, the lowest plant height was recorded with the unweeded control. However, there were no significant differences among Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing and Fluroxypyr + urea.

Table 3: Plant height (cm), number of leaves/plant as well as fresh and dry weight of maize plant (g) after 50 and 70 days from sowing as affected by weed control treatments during 2000 and 2001 seasons

| Treatments | At 50 days from sowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | At 70 days from sowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Plant height (cm) |  | Number of leaves/plant |  | Fresh weight of plant (g) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dry weight of } \\ \text { plant }(\mathrm{g}) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plant height } \\ \text { (cm) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Number of leaves/plant |  | Fresh weight of plant ( g ) |  | Dry weight of plant (g) |  |
|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 |
| Bentazon at $0.75 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 142.25 | 143.75 | 9.75 | 10.00 | 285.25 | 290.00 | 57.05 | 58.00 | 163.75 | 165.30 | 11.75 | 11.76 | 514.75 | 52025 | 102.95 | 104.05 |
| Fluroxypyr at $0.2 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed | 163.00 | 166.00 | 12.00 | 12.25 | 430.00 | 420.50 | 86.00 | 84.10 | 214.00 | 220.50 | 13.00 | 13.01 | 684.25 | 694.25 | 13685 | 138.85 |
| Metosulam at $03 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 146.00 | 147.50 | 9.75 | 10.00 | 295.00 | 300.00 | 59.00 | 60.00 | 168.75 | 170.00 | 1150 | 11.75 | 526.00 | 5407 | 105.20 | 08.15 |
| isoproturon at $11 / \mathrm{fed}$ | 132.75 | 133.75 | 9.25 | 9.00 | 223.75 | 215.00 | 44.75 | 43.00 | 146.25 | 147.50 | 11.00 | 10.75 | 490.00 | 500.75 | 98.00 | 100.15 |
| Bentazon at $0.375 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ +urea $1 \%$ | 147.75 | 150.00 | 10.00 | 10.50 | 322.00 | 312.00 | 64.40 | 62.40 | 175.00 | 175.50 | 12.00 | 12.01 | 547.00 | 560.25 | 109.40 | 112.05 |
| Fluroxypyr at $0.1 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed + urea $1 \%$ | 156.25 | 159.25 | 11.00 | 11.75 | 370.00 | 360.00 | 74.00 | 72.00 | 198.25 | 200.75 | 12.25 | 12.75 | 616.50 | 625.40 | 123.30 | 125.08 |
| Metosulam at $0.15 \mathrm{i} . \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 151.75 | 154.00 | 10.75 | 11.00 | 341.00 | 331.60 | 68.20 | 66.32 | 175.50 | 180.00 | 12.25 | 12.26 | 570.75 | 600.00 | 114.15 | 12000 |
| isoproturon at $0.5 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fe}$ d + urea 1\% | 147.25 | 148.75 | 10.00 | 10.25 | 317.00 | 310.00 | 63.40 | 62.00 | 170.75 | 173.00 | 12.00 | 11.75 | 536.25 | 550.50 | 107.25 | 110.10 |
| One hand hoeing | 136.00 | 137.00 | 9.50 | 9.50 | 263.00 | 250.00 | 52.60 | 50.00 | 157.25 | 151.00 | 11.25 | 11.26 | 511.50 | 504.75 | 102.30 | 100.95 |
| Two hand hoeing | 160.25 | 163.25 | 11.00 | 12.00 | 425.00 | 410.00 | 85.00 | 82.00 | 208.25 | 215.75 | 12.75 | 13.00 | 619.75 | 630.50 | 123.95 | 126.10 |
| Control | 122.00 | 122.25 | 8.50 | 8.75 | 182.25 | 190.00 | 36.45 | 38.00 | 128.00 | 130.00 | 10.00 | 10.01 | 318.00 | 340.75 | 63.60 | 68.15 |
| F-test | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | * | *** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| LSD 5\% | 8.64 | 10.78 | 0.83 | 1.16 | 22.32 | 11.23 | 4.46 | 2.25 | 11.46 | 12.31 | 1.19 | 1.24 | 36.67 | 25.27 | 7.33 | 5.05 |
| 1\% | 11.52 | 14.37 | 1.11 | 1.55 | 29.76 | 14.97 | 5.95 | 2.99 | 15.28 | 16.41 | 1.58 | 1.65 | 48.90 | 33.69 | 978 | 6.74 |

B.2. Number of leaves/plant:

Data in Table 3 revealed that weed control treatments markedly increased number of leaves/plant after 50 and 70 days from sowing. Fluroxypyr and two hand hoeing gave the maximum numbers of leaves/plant followed by that of Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Metosulam, respectively in both seasons. Viceversa, the lowest number of leaves/plant was recorded with unweeded control.

## B.3.Fresh and dry weight of plant (g): <br> Fresh and dry weight of

 plant appreciably influenced by weed control method in 2000 and 2001 seasons. The results in Table 3 show that all weed control treatments markedly increased fresh and dry weight of maize plant after 50 and 70 days from sowing as compared with the unweeded treatment. The best effect on fresh and dry weight of plant was markedly realized by foliar spraying with Fluroxypyr treatment followed by two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea, respectively. Whereas, the unweeded treatment gave the lowest fresh and dry weight ofplant after 50 and 70 days from sowing.

Generally, it can be concluded that the highest increase in growth of maize plants were achieved from plots treated with Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea and Metosulam + urea. The improvement effects of the studied weed treatments may be attributed to their effectiveness with maize plants for light, water, nutrients and space, thus enhancing plant growth. Same results were obtained by Rizk and El-Bially (1996), Ahmed (1999) and Abd El-Samie (2000).

## C. Yield and yield attributes:

These studies include observation on plant height at harvest (cm), stem diameter (cm), ear diameter (cm), ear length (cm), number of grains/row, ear grain weight (g), shelling percentage, 100 -grain weight (g) and grain yield (ardab/fed).

## C.I. Plant height (cm):

Data in Table 4 revealed that weed control treatments significantly increased plant height at harvest in both seasons. Two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam and Metosulam + urea produced the highest values of plant height in
both seasons as compared with that of unweeded treatment gave the lowest plant height.

## C.2. Stem diameter (cm):

It is evident that stem diameter significantly affected by different weed control treatments in both seasons (Table 4). All herbicidal treatments and two hand hoeing produced higher stem diameter than unweeded plots. Application of two hand hoeing followed by Fluroxypyr and Fluroxypyr + urea increased stem diameter compared with the other treatments. In C'ontrast, the lowest stem diameter was recorded with unweeded treatment.

## C.3. Ear diameter and length (cm):

The results reported in Table 4 showed that elimination of maize weed with different weed control treatments increased statistically ear diameter and length. The results clearly showed that Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea and Metosulam + urea were the best treatments for increasing the ear diameter and length and exceeded other weed control treatments. However, there were no significant differences among Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea and

Metosulam + urea. In contrast, the lowest values of ear diameter and length were obtained by the unweeded treatment.

## C.4. Numbers of grains/row:

The highest increase in number of grains/row was obtained with Fluroxypyr treatment followed by two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea. The increases amounted to 32.52 , $30.67,28.22,23.31$ and $22.09 \%$ in the first season and 22.41, 20.11, 18.97, 17.24 and 15.52 in the second season over the unweeded treatment, respectively as shown in Table 4. On the other hand, the lowest increase in number of grains/row over unweeded was recorded with Isoproturon treatment.

## C.5. Ear grains weight (g):

The results presented in Table 5 show the effect of different weed control treatments on ear grain weight in both seasons. All herbicidal treatments and hand hoeing markedly produced higher ear grains weight than the unveeded plots. In both seasons. the highest increase in ear grains weight was obtained by Fluroxypyr treatment followed by that of two hand hoeing and

Fluroxypyr + urea treatments. In contrast, the lowest increase in ear grains weight over unweeded was recorded with Isoproturon treatment.

## C.6. Shelling \%

Weed control methods by using Fluroxypyr or two hand hoeing significantly affected the shelling \% in the two seasons (Table 5). The maximum shelling $\% 82.06$ and 82.13 in 2000 and 2001 seasons, respectively were achieved by using Fluroxypyr treatment followed by two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea, respectively in both seasons. The lowest shelling \% 78.31 and 78.95 in the first and second seasons. respectively were obtained from the untreated (control).

## C.7. 100-grain weight (g)

The results revealed that all weed control methods statistically increased 100 -grain weight in both seasons (Table 5). The highest increase in 100 -grain weight was obtained by Fluroxypyr treatment followed by that of two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea treatments without any significant differences between
them. On the other hand, the lowest increase in 100 -grain weight over the unweeded treatment was recorded with Isoproturon treatment.

It can be concluded that the highest increases in yield attributes of maize plants were achieved from plots treated with Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea, Metosulam + urea and Bentazon + urea treatments, respectively. The superiority of these treatments in this respect contributed in controlling maize weeds and consequently improved yield components of maize. These results are in general agreement with those obtained by El-Gazzar et al. (1996), Hussein (1996), Mosalem and Shady (1996), Rizk and El-Bially (1996), Sharma et al. (1998) and El-Metwally et al. (2001).

## C.8. Grain yield (ardab/fed)

Grain yield was significantly affected by different weed control methods in both seasons (Table 5). All herbicidal treatments and hand hoeing significantly produced higher grain yield than the unweeded plots. The highest increase in grain yield was obtained with Fluroxypyr treatment followed by two hand hoeing, Fluroxypyr + urea,

Metosulam, Metosulam + urea, Bentazon and Bentazon + urea, respectively. The increases amounted to $86.22,81.32,79.70$, $72.56,68.22,66.98$ and $63.25 \%$ in the first season and 89.94, 83.40, 79.87, 71.70, 71.07, 68.55 and $67.92 \%$ in the second season over the unweeded treatment, respectively. On the other hand, the lowest increase in grain yield over the unweeded was recorded with Isoproturon + urea treatment. However, there were no significant differences among Fluroxypyr, two hand hoeing and Fluroxypyr mixed with urea. The superiority of Fluroxypyr in producing high grain yield might be due to its high efficiency in controlling broad spectrum of weeds without damage to maize plants. This reduced the competitive effect of weeds and leading to the increase in grain yield. These results are in good accordance with those obtained by Moshtohry et al. (1995), Ahmed (1999), Wilcut et al. (1999), Krausz et al. (2000) and ElMetwally et al. (2001).

## D. Chemical composition of maize grains:

## D.1. Grains protein \%:

These results revealed that all weed control treatments significantly increased protein
percentage as shown in Table 5. The highest protein percentage was recorded with two hand hoeing treatment ( 9.47 and $9.44 \%$ ) in the first and second seasons, respectively compared with other treatments followed by Fluroxypyr, Fluroxypyr + urea and Metosulam + urea. The lowest protein percentage was resulted from untreated plots ( 8.55 and $8.50 \%$ ) in 2000 and 2001 seasons, respectively. Similar results were confirmed by Metwally et al. (1994). Ahmed (1999) and El-Metwally et al. (2001).

## D.2. Grains oil percentage:

Data indicated that all weed control treatments increased markedly the oil percentage than the unweeded treatment (Table 5). The highest increase in oil $\%$ was obtained by two hand hoeing treatment followed by Fluroxypyr and Fluroxypyr mixed with urea treatments, respectively. These superior treatments increased the average of oil percentage than the unweeded treatment by about 12.56, 12.09 and $11.37 \%$ in the first season and 13.49, 13.25 and $12.53 \%$ in the second one, respectively. On the contrary, the lowest increase in oil\% over the unweeded treatment was recorded with Isoproturon treatment. These

Table 5: Ear grains weight (g), shelling \%, 100-grain weight (g), grain yield (ardab/fed), grains protein \% and grains oil \% as affected by weed control treatments during 2000 and 2001 seasons.

| Treatments . | Ear grains weight ( g ) |  | Shelling $\%$ |  | 100-grain weight (g) |  | Grain yield (ardab/fed) |  | Grains protein $\%$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grains oil } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 | 2000 | 2001 |
| Bentazon at $0.75 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 191.30 | 190.50 | 80.59 | 80.98 | 40.49 | 40.70 | 27.10 | 27.20 | 8.99 | 8.94 | 4.55 | 4.50 |
| Fluroxypyr at $0.2 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed | 230.60 | 235.00 | 82.06 | 82.13 | 44.21 | 44.20 | 30.00 | 30.20 | 9.43 | 9.40 | 4.73 | 4.70 |
| Metosulam at $0.3 \mathrm{~L} /$ fed | 195.70 | 195.90 | 80.95 | 81.01 | 41.80 | 40.91 | 27.80 | 27.30 | 9.06 | 9.02 | 4.58 | 4.53 |
| Isoproturon at $1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}$ | 179.80 | 180.80 | 79.91 | 80.00 | 40.02 | 39.80 | 25.5 | 25.80 | 8.85 | 8.80 | 4.48 | 4.41 |
| Bentazon at 0.375 <br> L/fed+urea 1\%  | 203.50 | 208.31 | 81.37 | 81.56 | 43.60 | 41.32 | 26.30 | 26.70 | 9.17 | 9.13 | 4.63 | 4.58 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fluroxypyr at } 0.1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+ \\ & \text { urea } 1 \% \end{aligned}$ | 220.00 | 226.75 | 81.64 | 81.87 | 43.75 | 43.10 | 28.95 | 28.60 | 9.39 | 9.36 | 4.70 | 4.67 |
| Metosulam at $0.15 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 212.30 | 217.50 | 81.54 | 81.71 | 43.70 | 42.50 | 26.90 | 26.80 | 9.25 | 9.21 | 4.67 | 4.64 |
| Isoproturon at $0.5 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{fed}+$ urea $1 \%$ | 201.75 | 202.50 | 81.14 | 81.04 | 42.35 | 41.23 | 24.60 | 25.00 | 9.12 | 9.08 | 4.61 | 4.56 |
| One hand hoeing | 186.50 | 188.30 | 80.50 | 80.17 | 40.14 | 40.66 | 24.90 | 24.60 | 8.95 | 8.90 | 4.50 | 4.42 |
| Two hand hoeing | 225.50 | 229.50 | 81.88 | 81.99 | 44.13 | 43.40 | 29.21 | 29.16 | 9.47 | 9.44 | 4.75 | 4.71 |
| Control | 123.80 | 120.90 | 78.31 | 78.95 | 29.60 | 30.80 | 16.11 | 15.90 | 8.55 | 8.50 | 4.22 | 4.15 |
| F-test | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ${ }^{* *}$ | ** | ** |
| LSD 5\% | 5.50 | 4.93 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 2.21 | 3.22 | 1.15 | 1.08 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.25 |
| 1\% | 7.33 | 6.57 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 2.95 | 4.29 | 1.53 | 1.44 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 0.33 |

findings are supported by Metwally et al. (1994), Ahmed (1999) and El-Metwally et al. (2001).

## CONCLUSION

In general, two hand hoeing and application of herbicide treatments decreased significantly the fresh and dry weight of maize weeds in both seasons. Such results indicated that two hand hoeing and herbicidal treatments were efficient in increasing productivity of maize and the highest grain yield of maize can be obtained by two hand hoeing or choosing the most suitable herbicides (Fluroxypyr, Fluroxypyr mixed with urea, Metosulam mixed with urea and Bentazon mixed with urea).
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# فعالية إضافة اليوريا على كفاءة بعض مبيدات الحشاتُش <br> فى مكافحة الحشائش المصاحبة 

## لمحصول الأرة الشامية

إبراهيم محد المتولى
قسم النبات - المركز اللقومئ للبحوث - الدفى - التاهرة - مصر

للبحوث بشُلقان محافظة القليوبية بهـ دراسة تأثير إضافة اليوريا بتركيز (\% المحلول مبيـد

 العزيق مرة ، العزيث مرتين ثم الكنترول وتد أظمبرت الننائح كالثالى:
 للحشائش المصاحبة النبات اللنرة بالمقارنة بالكنترول . وتد أعطى الفلورروكسييير منفرداً الفضل


 الفلوروكسيبير منفردا نُم الفلوروكسيبير + (\% يوريا وعموما لم يكن هناك فروق معنوية بين
 أدى استخدام معاملات مكافحة الحشائش إلى زيادة معنوية لصنات النمر والمور والمحصول
 v. العزيق مرتين إلى زيادة معنوية فى طول النبات وعدي الأورا






 الفلوروكسيبير منفردأ أل مخلوطأ مـع ا\% يوريا أو العزيق مرتين تحـــت ظـــروت منطقــة

